



**Research note: Decentralization: An elusive quest?**

*A response to Schrape*

Hasberg, Kirsten Sophie

*Creative Commons License*  
CC BY-SA 4.0

*Publication date:*  
2019

*Document Version*  
Other version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Hasberg, K. S. (2019). *Research note: Decentralization: An elusive quest? A response to Schrape.*

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Research note:

## **Decentralization: An elusive quest? A response to Schrape**

*Bibliographical note: This research note was the basis for the initiation of a productive dialogue with Dr. Jan-Felix Schrape, University of Stuttgart. It is part of a forthcoming cover essay of my PhD thesis on information and energy systems in a power perspective - please cite the cover essay<sup>1</sup>.*

In his recent article titled “The Promise of Technological Decentralization. A Brief Reconstruction”, Schrape (2019) sketches out the elusive quest for peer production in information systems. By linking the history of the internet, the hippie movement and today’s blockchain hype, he shows how attempts for decentralization end in demise and show how we don’t learn from history. He sees this to be caused by the logic of “digital utopianism” that results in “patterns of complexity reduction” (Schrape 2019).

While I do agree with parts of his diagnosis, especially the problematization of techno-determinist belief systems where “technological infrastructures are conventionalized as a means of overcoming solidified social problems” (Schrape 2019), I argue that rather than inevitable centralization, history teaches us that the struggle between decentralization and centralization is an ongoing struggle.

Histories of the internet (Rosenzweig, 1998; Graves 2011; Treguer 2017) show that the movement towards centralization is not inevitable, or, to cite Rosenzweig 1998, “the road toward monopolization and centralized control is not preordained”, although today’s concentration in information systems would support such a view.

Although the quest for data democracy might seem elusive at times, there is no historical determinism that supports this inevitability. Rather, a closer look at power structures of infrastructures reveals why especially the information (and energy) sectors display structural inertia, path dependency and, in the case of the energy sector, carbon lock in. I argue that even in the information sector, power structures are an important determinant of decentralization-recentralization outcomes.

With this response, I thus attempt to give a broader view on decentralization – recentralization struggles in information systems.

## **Cited works:**

Graves L. Review essay: The struggle for internet freedom. *Glob Media Commun* 2011;7:149–58. doi:10.1177/1742766511410221.

Rosenzweig R. Wizards , Bureaucrats , Warriors , and Hackers : Writing the History of the Internet. *Am Hist Rev* 1998;103:1530–52.

Schrape, Jan-Felix. 2019. *Technology and the Promise of Decentralization: Origins, Development, Patterns of Arguments*. 01. SOI Discussion Paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://vbn.aau.dk/en/persons/135747/projects/>

Schrape, Jan Felix. 2019. The Promise of Technological Decentralization. A Brief Reconstruction. *Society* 56. Society: 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-018-00321-w>.

Tréguer F. Gaps and bumps in the political history of the internet. *Internet Policy Rev* 2017;6:1–21. doi:10.14763/2017.4.714.

### **Relevant literature:**

Cummings S. Centralization and decentralization: The never-ending story of separation and betrayal. *Scand J Manag* 1995;11:103–17.

de Rosnay MD, Musiani F. Towards a (de)centralisation-based typology of peer production. *TripleC* 2016;14:189–207.

Dolata U, Schrape J-F. Kollektivität und Macht im Internet. *Kollekt. und Macht im Internet*, Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden; 2017, p. 1–5. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-17910-6\_1.

Mathew AJ. The myth of the decentralised internet. *Internet Policy Rev* 2016;5:1–16. doi:10.14763/2016.3.425.

Muellerleile C, Robertson SL. Digital Weberianism: Bureaucracy , Information , and the Techno-rationality of 2018;25:187–217.

Karlstrøm H. Do libertarians dream of electric coins? The material embeddedness of bitcoin. *Distinktion* 2014;15:23–36. doi:10.1080/1600910X.2013.870083.

Pedroni M. Sharing economy as an anti-concept. *First Monday* 2019;24:1–16. doi:10.5210/fm.v24i2.9113.

Reijers W, Ossewaarde M. Digital commoning and its challenges. *Organization* 2018;25:819–24. doi:10.1177/1350508418757571.

Schmidt VA. Democratizing France: The Political and Administrative History of Decentralization. Cambridge University Press; 1990. doi:10.2307/2165584.

Verborgh R. Re-decentralizing the Web, for good this time. In: Seneviratne O, Hendler J, editors. *World's Inf. Tim Berners-Lee's Invent. World Wide Web*, ACM; 2019, p. accepted for publication.

Vries MS de. The rise and fall of decentralization: A comparative analysis of arguments and practices in European countries. *Eur J Polit Res* 2000;38:193–224. doi:10.1023/A:1007149327245.